



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/776,112

02/11/2004

Vincent Charles Konzola

RPS920030163US1

2680

45211

7590

10/05/2004

KELLY K. KORDZIK  
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK PC  
PO BOX 50784  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

HESS, DANIEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/776,112

**Applicant(s)**

CONZOLA, VINCENT CHARLES

**Examiner**

Daniel A Hess

**Art Unit**

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/11/04.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bellis, Jr. et al. (US 2003/0024982).

Re claim 1: Bellis, Jr. et al. teaches a checkout system (figure 1). Although the entire document is relevant, paragraphs [0007] and [0030] taken together are highly instructive, teaching that (a) a product has physical characteristics which are stored in relation to that product, (b) during check-out, various physical characteristics of the product are measured and (c) a determination is made as to whether there is a match. As is made clear in paragraph [0040], if an item properly verifies based on its physical characteristics, a signal to a security tag deactivator causes a security tag to be deactivated. Other limitations are inherent from steps (a) to (c). A careful reading of the limitations of claim 1 along with Bellis, Jr. et al. shows that all of the claimed limitations are taught.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 2-5: As paragraph [0030] states, weight, volume (i.e. size), height / width / length (i.e. shape) and color are all among the physical characteristics which may be measured.

Re claim 6: As is made clear in [0030], weight and shape are both measured in sequence.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellis, Jr. et al.

Re claim 7: Paragraph [0040] makes clear that some products may have surveillance tags while others may not. Although it is not explicitly stated, it would be at least obvious if not inherent for the computer system to track whether a particular product

Art Unit: 2876

has a security tag or not, so that the deactivation system doesn't run when there is no tag to deactivate.

Re claim 8: These are all aspects that are either explicit or implied in claim 1 above.

Claims 9-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellis, Jr. et al. in view of Novak (US 5,497,314).

Re claims 9-14: These claims nearly follow from claims 1-6, respectively, which have been discussed above. The difference here is that claim 9 refers to an 'enclosed area.'

Novak teaches (column 2, lines 10-37) that the physical characteristics of objects are measured in an *enclosed area* of a checkout.

In view of Novak's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known measurement of physical characteristics in an enclosed area at the checkout because otherwise a would-be shoplifter might interfere with sensor results inside the measurement area.

Re claim 15: Novak's enclosure takes objects one at a time. Novak (column 3, lines 30-50) measures the exact position of the edge of the object and captures its boundaries; clearly the system would detect and prevent the placement of two objects at once. It has been stated (column 3, lines 15-20) that objects are to be examined one at a time.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 16 and 17: Generating an alert would be a necessary step because only a customer or other person could correct the problem in Novak of two objects placed together in the enclosure. Clearly, deactivation would not then occur because verification in this situation has not been successful.

Re claims 18-23: See discussion re claim 9-14 above.

Re claims 24-29: See discussion re claim 9-14 above. The difference is that claim 24 recites the limitation that a database stores the physical characteristics of the objects. Bellis et al. teaches (see paragraph [0019]) a database for storing this same info.

Re claims 30-32: See discussion re claims 15-17, respectively, above.

### ***Remarks***

Novak (US 5,497,314) has been used as a secondary reference herein. It should be clear to the applicant that it could also have been employed in a 35 USC 102b rejection for a number of the claims.

Also, the applicant should observe that many of the inventions disclosed in the IDS of 2/11/04, particular those with NCR as an assignee, teach most, if not all, of the claimed invention.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel A Hess whose telephone number is (571) 272-2392. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM M-F.

Art Unit: 2876

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DH

Daniel A Hess  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2876



KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER